

THE NATIONAL CAPITAL

A LOCAL MUNICIPALITY BUT, UNDER THE CONSTITUTION, THE SEAT OF GOVERNMENT OF
THE UNITED STATES

AN ADDRESS

BEFORE THE DU PONT CIVICS CLASS
OF WILMINGTON, DEL., ON
JANUARY 20, 1914

DELIVERED BY

HENRY LITCHFIELD WEST

FORMER COMMISSIONER OF THE
DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA



PRESENTED BY MR. GALLINGER

FEBRUARY 9, 1914.—Referred to the Committee on Printing
FEBRUARY 13, 1914.—Reported favorably and ordered to be printed

WASHINGTON

1914

83



THE NATIONAL CAPITAL.

LOCAL MUNICIPALITY BUT, UNDER THE CONSTITUTION, THE SEAT OF THE GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

Speech delivered by HENRY LITCHFIELD WEST, former Commissioner of the District of Columbia, before the Du Pont Civics Class of Wilmington, Del.

Problems confronted the founders of this Government, but none more urgent than the necessity of establishing the seat of government in some locality where the power of the Federal Government should be supreme. The presence of the Congress in Philadelphia became embarrassing, not to say perilous, because of the debt of the unpaid soldiers of the Revolution. The State authorities, largely sympathizing with the poverty-stricken and deserving veterans, were reluctant and possibly unable to afford the protection which more than once, was imperatively demanded.

The men who composed the Constitutional Convention saw in this situation both a warning and a menace as to the future. They decided in the very beginning that a Federal territory must be created and there was no discussion save as to its proper designation. "The seat of the General Government," "the seat of the Federal Government," "the seat of the national business," and "the central residence of the Government" were some of the titles considered, with the final adoption of the words in the Constitution, "the seat of the Government of the United States." This is what the District of Columbia is to-day. It is a territory set apart and isolated from the rest of the United States, occupying a position absolutely unique in our country and unparalleled anywhere, by knowledge, save only in Mexico and Australia. As originally created it was 10 miles square, but in 1843 the land south of the District and within Virginia was ceded back to that State, leaving the present area of about 70 square miles, but with the question of whether the retrocession was constitutional still undetermined. Congress was given power by the Constitution to exercise "exclusive jurisdiction in all cases whatsoever" in the District, and assumed jurisdiction on February 21, 1801.

Earlier Congresses were determined, apparently, to make the District of Columbia a Federal territory in fact as well as in name. For 2 years the mayor was appointed by the President, with only a council elected by the people. It was not until 1820 that the residents were allowed to choose their own mayor. From that time until 1871—a period of 50 years—the District government was administered upon a purely local basis, with Congress persistently neglecting its responsibilities toward the National Capital. The result will be imagined. There was no commercial development in the District—it never was intended to be anything more than the

seat of government—and the population, consisting principally of underpaid Government employees, was not wealthy. What had been a great and beautiful city was nothing more than a sorry village. Grass grew in the streets, which were dusty in summer and veritable quagmires in winter. The houses were dilapidated and the parks were like waste places. Visitors from abroad, such as Charles Dickens's *American Notes*—found much to ridicule and condemn. The people did what they could, paying the expenses from their own pockets, but their well-intended efforts fell far short of actual requirements. It was then as it would be to-day if the city should be thrown back upon its own inadequate resources.

It is difficult to say how much longer this condition would have continued had not a great political change been effected by the outcome of the Civil War. When peace was declared Washington became the Mecca of thousands upon thousands of people from the neighboring States of Maryland, Virginia, and North Carolina, attracted by the Freedmen's Bureau and the hope of being cared for by the Federal Government. This population, just freed from the thralldom of slavery, was endowed with the same deplorable condition resulted. The ignorance and cupidity of the colored population was preyed upon, and election day became a day to which the peacefully disposed element in the community looked forward with real anxiety. Congress solved the problem by giving to everybody, white and black, the right to vote. It established by law in 1871 a new form of government, consisting of a governor appointed by a board of public works appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, an upper house of a Territorial legislature appointed by the President, and a lower house elected by the people. Each member was also a Delegate in Congress. The first governor was a man who left no particular impress upon the community. The second, Alexander R. Shepherd, was a law unto himself. Through the public works he tore down the old and the ugly, he smoothed and straightened the rough and crooked places; he pictured in his eye the Washington of the future, and for this ideal city he laid the foundation. The work was done, however, with ruthless sacrifice, sacrificing the individual for the public good. The injured property owners cried aloud to Congress. The District was being flooded with certificates of indebtedness which might or might not be worth the paper they were engraved upon. A debt of \$25,000,000, enormous in those days, had been incurred, not by the will of the people but by the agents of Congress, in whose selection the people had no voice and the air was filled with the scandals which were the necessary sequence of lavish expenditure of money in public works under the more or less irresponsible direction.

Once again Congress gave its consideration to the government of its Federal Territory. Popular elections seemed impossible. A gubernatorial experiment had been unsuccessful. In a moment of inspiration—and, in the light of experience, it was an inspired idea—a new scheme was devised. Congress enacted a law in 1874 providing that the District should be governed by three commissioners appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, two of whom should be and an officer of the Engineer Corps of the Army not under the rank of major. This form of government was admittedly temporary, and during the next four years, while Congress still struggled

er, the commissioners, who were really the receivers of a
not corporation, gave such a satisfactory administration that
s decided in 1878 to give permanency to the system. From
t the present time, a period of 40 years, the District of Columbia
en governed by the commission form of government. The
sioners, chosen from the people, are naturally concerned for
al welfare of the District; and yet, having been selected by
resident of the United States and confirmed by the Senate, they
represent the National Government. In this dual capacity they
enter the affairs of the National Capital and wield a power
ely unique.

law of 1878, providing for a permanent form of government
District of Columbia, is popularly known as the organic act.
not hastily enacted, but was the result of four years' careful
oration to the needs of the National Capital. The act of one
rs can not, of course, be regarded as binding upon succeeding
rses, and yet there is no doubt that the men who framed this
law hoped and believed that they had insured to the people
District of Columbia a happy freedom from all future disturb-
No one can read the numerous pages of the prolonged debate
being convinced that the men who laid the foundation of the
form of government in the District were actuated by the
gt that they were building for all time. They planned a gov-
et which, to use their own words, would not be subject to the
rs and changes of party politics; they expressed the hope that
years came and went the Nation's capital would commend
to the solicitous care of the representatives of the people of all
e; they showed that its expenditures would necessarily be
the resources of the resident population; and, finally, when
proposed to put into the law the usual phrase, "Congress
vs the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act," the suggestion
deliberately voted down. More than this, when a question
ing this organic act came before the Supreme Court of the
e States, that tribunal specifically declared that the law was
s title declared it to be, viz, a permanent form of government
h District of Columbia. In the words of the decision, "It is
stitution of the District of Columbia."

ivital phrase in this organic act provides that Congress shall
ce the budget of District expenses and shall appropriate 50 per
f this amount, the remaining 50 per cent to be levied and
sd against private property and privileges in the District of
bia. This is what is known as the half and half principle.
never was any doubt in the mind of Congress as to the necessity
te equity of placing upon the Federal Government a generous
of the expense of maintaining and developing the National
t. The only question was as to the ratio, and during the
eration of this detail the House rejected all figures less than
cent. This basis was then deemed equitable and just, and it
st none of these characteristics as the years have passed.
b contrary, if 50 per cent was fair and proper 40 years ago, as
ten universally conceded, it is eminently so to-day, when the
cal Government has acquired additional large tracts of land
hus removed them from the revenue-producing area. In
on to this, the constantly growing pride in the National Capital

incurs a high degree of expenditure in every detail of local administration not demanded in other cities, and this, in turn, necessitates a steadily increasing burden of local taxation.

The 50 per cent appropriation made by Congress under the act would be perfectly justifiable if it were nothing more than an expression of national interest in the seat of government. It is, however, much more than this. It is the assessment paid by the owner for the maintenance of a common possession. The Government of the United States owns an enormous amount of property—fully 50 per cent—in the District of Columbia. The streets and avenues are owned in fee simple by the Federal Government. They are unusually wide, and more than 200 miles of asphalt pavement must be kept in good condition. The local police force must protect the lives and property of the Government officials, high and low. The local fire department must be prepared to protect the numerous Government buildings from destruction. The schools must provide satisfactory educational facilities to the children of all persons connected with the Government, even though those persons may not be taxpayers. The local health department must see that the city is free from unhealthy conditions. In a hundred ways the interests of the Federal and local governments are interwoven. Moreover, the streets and sidewalks around the public buildings and parks must be kept in thorough repair. It is, therefore, eminently right and proper, viewed only from the standpoint of joint ownership, and ignoring all patriotic consideration, that the United States should contribute its share of the local expenses. It does not make a contribution as a gratuity. It enjoys its full quota of all the good results obtained through the expenditure of its funds.

That the organic act was a wise measure is shown by the fact that the date of its enactment marked the beginning of a new Washington. Previous to that time the National Capital was provincial and unimproved. It could not, in the very nature of things, have been otherwise. On the other hand, everything that Washington is to-day is due to the half and half principle embodied in the act. If it is finally to take its place among the capitals of the world, if it is now an object of universal national pride instead of a byword and a reproach, it is because it was lifted by Congress from the level of a mere municipality and placed upon the high plane of a national city.

The history and operation of the organic act are matters of immediate and vital interest because of a disposition recently manifested in Congress to secure its repeal. Bills have already been introduced proposing to overthrow the existing form of government and to abolish the half and half principle. The advocates of these measures make two assertions:

First. That it is an anomaly that suffrage does not exist in the capital of a nation whose government rests upon the ballot.

Second. That it is not fair to place upon the citizens of the United States any part of the expense of maintaining the National Capital.

The first statement is undoubtedly true, but we are dealing with facts and not with theories. The fact is that for 40 years the existing form of government has been honest, efficient, and progressive. It may be true, as the late Senator John J. Ingalls once epigrammatically remarked, that the best-governed city in the United States is that where the people do not govern themselves, the people ought not

sed by having bad government thrust upon them. One of the reasons why it is honestly and efficiently governed is that the United States is in supreme control. As the District of Columbia is the seat of government, it would be unwise and improper for the Federal Government to relinquish any degree of its jurisdiction. It is a proposition which can not be successfully controverted that the Government can do with justice to itself and to the American people surrender to local interests its extensive interests and its vital concern in the continued existence of the Nation's Capital.

In second statement I absolutely deny. There might be some question for it if the citizens of the District did not bear their full share of the burden of taxation. As a matter of fact, they do this more. The revenues of the District of Columbia from all forms of taxation, real estate, personal, franchises, licenses, etc., amounted last year to \$7,000,000. As the population is approximately 350,000, at a per capita tax of about \$20 for every man, woman, and child, including nearly 100,000 colored people, an amount exceeded by only a few cities in the United States. The impression which has carelessly and credulously created that the citizens of the District of Columbia are underassessed and undertaxed is absolutely false. The latest assessment in the District lays upon real property a taxable value of \$30,000,000, upon a two-thirds valuation basis, while the personal and public utilities franchise assessment, which in 1913 was over \$60,000, will this year reach the \$50,000,000 mark. The aggregate of taxable real and personal property is above \$400,000,000, a much larger than is shown in many cities which exceed Washington in size and wealth. At the fixed rate of 1½ per cent the amount to be paid by citizens of the District in real and personal taxation alone will be over \$6,000,000, an amount which other forms of taxation will increase to \$7,500,000. As has been stated by Mr. Theodore W. Noyes, the thoroughly informed editor of the Washington Evening Star—

Washington per capita tax levy is exceeded by only 17 cities, New York, Chicago, Pittsburgh, Buffalo, San Francisco, Cincinnati, Los Angeles, Seattle, Denver, St. Paul, Springfield, Mass., Yonkers, Atlantic City, Newton, Mass., Mount Vernon, Niagara Falls, and Pasadena. Omitting San Francisco, Los Angeles, Seattle, St. Paul, and Pasadena, for the reason that taxation in Pacific coast cities is notably high for reasons which do not obtain in other parts of the country, there remain only 12 cities in which the actual tax levy is greater than that borne by the Washingtonian. Of these, only Buffalo and Cincinnati are in any wise comparable with Washington, and both of them very greatly exceed it in point of concentrated industrial wealth and consequent taxpaying ability.

When the comparison directly with the cities of approximately Washington's size is made, but all greatly its superior in point of industrial and commercial wealth and taxpaying ability, the per capita tax levy borne by the District citizen is seen to be exceptionally heavy.

The following table is then given:

Cincinnati.....	\$20.21	Detroit.....	\$15.87
Buffalo.....	18.69	New Orleans.....	15.66
Washington.....	18.15	Rochester.....	15.64
Indianapolis.....	17.23	Louisville.....	14.36
Cleveland.....	16.98	Kansas City.....	13.74
New York.....	16.65	St. Paul.....	12.98
San Francisco.....	16.46	Indianapolis.....	12.24
Waukegan.....	16.23	Jersey City.....	11.37
Chicago.....	16.08		

Having thus shown that the people of the District of Columbia are not tax dodgers but that they are compelled to pay heavily for maintaining the Capital upon a national basis, it is worth while to refer briefly to another form of criticism. It is frequently claimed that the assertion has been made more than once upon the floor of the House of Representatives, that suburban landowners have profited unduly at the expense of the National Treasury. This is certainly has not been the case during the past 20 years, for in 1899 a law was passed by Congress which made two specific provisions. The first was that in opening streets in the District of Columbia on the north side of the cities of Washington and Georgetown the cost of the improvement should be assessed equally against the abutting property and the District revenues, with nothing chargeable to the United States Treasury; while the second provision was that not one dollar of the improvement of these suburban streets should be taken from the United States Treasury. These improvements, greatly as they have added to the development of the District of Columbia and thus contributed to the beauty of the surroundings of Washington, have not cost the people of the United States a solitary penny. Connecticut Avenue extended, from Connecticut Avenue Bridge to Chevy Chase Circle, for instance, was donated throughout its entire length of 5 miles, and its improvement, representing an expenditure of nearly \$400,000, was paid for out of private funds. This magnificent boulevard, a gift to the Nation, is already a great highway and as the city grows will rival any avenue in the world.

Not only is the burden of taxation laid heavily upon the District but the amount which the people of the United States are called upon to contribute indirectly to the maintenance of the National Capital is so small as to be unworthy of serious consideration. It amounts to about \$6,000,000 annually, or approximately 6 cents per capita. In other words, it takes a \$20 bill each year from every man, woman and child in the District to make up the District revenues, while the contribution upon each American citizen outside of the District during the 12 months is equivalent to three 2-cent postage stamps—and the per capita wealth of the Nation in 1913 was over \$1,300. I deny that this minimum of expense is either onerous or objectionable. On the other hand, I have sufficient confidence in the pride and patriotism of the American people to believe that they make this meager contribution willingly. I insist, also, that the plea of economy urged as a sufficient reason for withdrawing Federal support from the National Capital does not appeal to the people. Provided that willful extravagance is avoided, they are not so much concerned with the amount that is spent as they are with the manner in which it is expended. In the District of Columbia there can not be extravagance, because not one dollar can be spent without the scrutiny and approval of both Houses of Congress. As to honesty, it is not sufficient to point to the 40 years of the present form of government with their entire freedom from graft and scandal.

If there is one thing more than another which demonstrates the impossibility of dealing with the District of Columbia upon the basis of an ordinary municipality it is the fact that in the District the dominant figure is the President of the United States. This, it seems to me, is most appropriate. He is the chosen representative of the American people and should share with Congress the responsibility

control of the seat of government. The relation of the President to the District of Columbia is most intimate. He appoints the Commissioners, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. He appoints the judges of the police and municipal courts, the recorder of deeds, the registrar of wills, the notaries public, and the members of the Board of Charities. He also appoints, of course, the judges of the higher courts. There is no compulsory application of the rule principle in any of these appointments, save only in the case of the District Commissioners, who must by law have been residents of the city for three years prior to their appointment. Offices can be, and frequently are, filled by citizens from various parts of the country. Experience has shown that Presidents can be safely trusted to make good selections. Since the present form of government was adopted not one commissioner has ever proven recreant to his trust. No one has ever been removed; but, more than this, no one has ever been indirectly charged with prostituting his high office to his dishonest ends. There has not been at any time even the suspicion of personal graft. As a natural corollary of this fact, the District employees have also been efficient, faithful, and honest. The men up above are to be trusted, the men below know that it is unsafe to offend. Instant punishment would follow. The President, as I know from experience, that the personnel of the force of District government is of an exceptionally high order and, so far as I can recall, there have been only one or two instances of wrongdoing among subordinates in 40 years. As against the effort to plunge once again upon the sea of political turmoil and possible confusion we point to this splendid record and appeal to Congress well enough alone.

It can be truthfully said that the government of the District of Columbia is clean because there is no opportunity for graft. On the other hand, the tremendous powers lodged in the three commissioners, which in some cities, be made highly remunerative. They have the power to appoint and remove the superintendent of police, the chief of the fire department, and, in fact, all the other officials and employees of the District government; but as there is no local politics—no need to reward nor enemies to punish—there is comparatively little change in the personnel of the official force. Meritorious employees are retained and promoted, stability and efficiency being secured by faithful service. More than this, the commissioners issue the shape of executive orders, the ordinances which in other municipalities are the work of aldermen and common councilmen. The President, of course, still retains its constitutional prerogative of legislative power, and in matters affecting taxation, licenses, streets, street extensions, etc., it enacts the necessary laws. Long ago, however, Congress found that it was literally impossible to burden the President with minor municipal regulation and it delegated its power to the commissioners. The latter therefore make the building regulations which have by law the force and effect of an act of Congress; the fire regulations, the health ordinances, and the police regulations. The authority upon which the latter are based shows the wide latitude of power vested in this triumvirate. It empowers the Commissioners—
 * * *
 to enforce all such reasonable and usual police regulations as they may deem necessary for the protection of lives, limbs, health, comfort, and quiet of all persons, and the protection of all property in the District of Columbia.

The Supreme Court of the United States has declared the enactment is as wide in its significance and application as the "general-welfare" clause of the Federal Constitution. The and other regulations issued by the commissioners cover practically every phase of municipal life affecting the individual, and yet the commissioners have ever been influenced in their issuance by no consideration than the welfare of the whole community.

Notice the words "reasonable and usual." Herein is the authority which the commissioners may exercise. Citizens believe that regulations are too drastic, and instances of this occasionally happen, may appeal to the courts upon the ground that the proposed requirements are unreasonable and unusual. It is fair to say, however, that the power reposed in the commissioners is never arbitrarily or autocratically exercised. They are always accessible and public hearings are invariably held when questions more than routine character are under consideration. Popular sentiment also finds expression through organizations known as associations which exist in all sections of the city and are especially active in the outlying or suburban settlements—for example, remembered, the commissioners govern some 12 or 15 towns of the city of Washington but still within the confines of the district. The officers of these associations frequently appear before the commissioners to present the needs of their localities. The papers of the city reflect to an unusual degree the sentiment of the community and thus exercise a potent influence. In addition to this, as indicating how the will of the people may obtain even in territory where no one votes for anybody or anything, the local option in neighborhood affairs. Barrooms can not be established without the consent of a majority of residents and property owners in the immediate vicinity of their proposed location, the same course must be pursued regarding merry-go-rounds, garages, blacksmith and machinery shops, etc. This local option has been found most effective in producing general contentment. The policy of the commissioners in recent years has been to operate in the field in which it can be exercised. It will thus be seen that the commissioners, even while they are enabled to do their full duty without fear of being affected by ordinary political considerations, are responsive to public sentiment. Not being infallible, they are of necessity make errors of judgment, but no commissioner has ever persistently run counter to the best judgment of the community and survive. The demand for his resignation or removal would be so great that no President could withstand it. The power of impeachment recall, by the way, is always vested in the President, and the President, charged with the destinies of the Republic may safely be trusted with the protection of the public interests in the District of Columbia. There is no place in the District of Columbia for a public official who is proven inefficient or dishonest or otherwise unqualified to hold a high place.

Much more might be said concerning this unique government, but it must suffice to assert that its system, which has produced such admirable and satisfactory results, seems to be the only one completely adaptable to the complex character of the territory of the seat of the Government of the United States. This is a distinction, let me repeat, which takes Washington out of the class

ordinary municipality. If it is to retain its national character and it will be a sad day for the Nation if this characteristic is lost—it must remain under governmental control. We who in the District of Columbia must pay for our privilege by denying ourselves the self-government enjoyed elsewhere, must even endure taxation without representation, because by so doing we are insuring the Nation a greater and grander Capital. This is easily demonstrated. If Congress should relinquish control of the District of Columbia and should install a purely local self-government based on suffrage, it would, in all justice, be compelled to allow that government to expend its own revenues. At the same time it would fully withdraw Federal support upon the ground that Federal money could not be expended by local authorities. This would mean the District would be thrown upon its own resources. One of two things would then happen—either the burden of taxation would have to be doubled in order to maintain the Capital upon its present basis or else every detail of the city's administration, including the maintenance of the broad avenues and the desirable program of artistic development, would have to be reduced one-half. The first would be fair to the people of the District of Columbia; the second would be even still more unfair to the people of the United States, who want to see progress and not retrogression in their National Capital.

One guaranty of honesty in the District of Columbia is the fact that the purse strings are entirely in the hands of Congress. Every dollar which is paid by the taxpayer goes into the Treasury of the United States and can not be taken out again except by an act of Congress. The taxpayer has no direct voice as to the manner in which his money is expended. It is not for him to say how many policemen or how many school-teachers shall be employed. It is true that the District Commissioners submit estimates of annual expenditures, but their estimates are subject to the scrutiny, criticism, and final approval of Congress. The purpose for which every dollar may be expended is legally set forth by law, and the money can not be otherwise used. In addition to this, the contracts and vouchers undergo examination in the Treasury of the United States, so that theft or graft becomes practically impossible. There is no city in the country where the taxpayer gets so much out of a dollar as in Washington. He gets it all, and for nothing sticks to anybody's hands. During the past 40 years the District government has been responsible for the expenditure of millions of dollars for public buildings, bridges, a filtration plant, a sewage-disposal system, and other great enterprises. The work has all been done without the loss of a cent or even the breath of a word. Is it any wonder that during recent years there should have been attracted to Washington a most desirable class of residents—those who have acquired a competence in commercial centers and who are glad to live in a city which is attractive and well kept, where society is cosmopolitan, where peace and order reign, with freedom from political disturbance, and where the constant march of progress is unchecked? This is the character of population which Washington, the Capital of the Nation, should continually invite, but which will never come should the city ever be compelled to lapse into a semi-barbarism of its former self.

In the effort to make Washington a city of advantages and beauty thus reflecting the highest type of citizenship, the people of the District of Columbia have heartily cooperated with the Representatives of the Nation. They have, for instance, distinctly avoided the establishment of commercial enterprises and have accepted with protest the law of Congress which makes it a serious misdemeanor to allow black or dense smoke to be emitted from any chimney. Consequently the whiteness of the Government buildings is not marred by smoke, smear, or grease. The absence of manufacturing industry due to the fact that the District of Columbia is the seat of government, has greatly interfered with the material advancement of Washington, so that there are no merchant princes or large wealth-producing properties. Business activity does not extend over the entire year, but is confined to the winter months, when Congress is in session and when the Capital is thronged by those who regard it merely as a winter residence. Washington, therefore, has no resources as contribute to the progress of other cities.

Although thus hampered by conditions which nowhere else prevail, the people of the District look forward with confidence to the Washington of the future. They know, of course, that the Washington to-day is not what Washington ought to be. They realize that this city, although founded in 1801, did not begin its career until the organic act was passed in 1878. We have still to make up the nearly 80 years during which the National Government treated the Capital with almost absolute neglect. Much has been done in these years, but much remains to be accomplished. Washington is not only the Capital as well as mine. You must want it to be, as we do, a metropolis—model in the cleanliness and efficiency of its government, in the perfect condition of its streets and avenues, in its educational facilities, in its respect for law, in its care for the unfortunate. In all, you must want it to be the model of the city beautiful. Pennsylvania Avenue, the most historic thoroughfare in the United States, ought to be transformed by the conversion of the plain, cheap, unattractive buildings on the south side into a series of magnificent Government structures, surrounded by ample grounds, until it should exceed in beauty the Champs d'Elysees in Paris or the Unter den Linden Strasse in Berlin. We want our broad streets and avenues lined by noble trees and our parks to present a charming picture to the eye. We want all that is ugly and repellent swept away and replaced by the artistic and uplifting. We want the great dome of the Capitol, whose massive proportions excited your admiration, and the towering shaft which commemorates the life and character of George Washington, to typify the Washington of the future. In this resolve we feel that we have the sympathy—as we know we must have the support—of every citizen of this Republic. The work which can not be accomplished unaided by the citizens of the District of Columbia.

There is in the Library of Congress Building in Washington a remarkable picture in mosaic work, each tiny bit of stone so arranged in its blending of color as to form a masterpiece of art. It seems to me that in the building up of Washington we want to work as the expert handler of mosaics, who, with infinite care, places a bit of color here and another bit of color there, until he finally pro-

ringly artistic and durable picture. Our bits of mosaic in the National Capital are buildings and fountains and statues and parks and trees and all the other accessories of a beautiful city. This is a picture which we are now creating, and in its making we ask a world-wide interest. I shall not attempt to portray what the United States will be a hundred years from now. Men of more vivid imagination and more gifted in the framing of eloquent sentences may attempt that pleasing task. It does not require the gift of prophecy, however, to predict that if the Nation will do its full and sacred duty the National Capital will grow as the Republic grows. I believe that this will be done, because I think that the country can safely trust its patriotism and sense of justice which actuate the men who represent the people of the United States in Congress. Hand in hand for 40 years the Nation and the citizens of the District have gone forward, bearing equitably the burden of maintaining the seat of government. The result is that the American people are beginning to be proud of their National Capital. Believing that the partnership under which so much development has been wrought will never be disturbed, we look forward confidently to the time, happily not distant, when Washington will challenge universal admiration not only in fact as well as in name, the worthy Capital of the greatest Republic the world has ever known.



